



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,090	03/26/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920010053US1	7726
65362	7590	05/01/2008		
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP			EXAMINER	
IBM Austin			BLACKWELL, JAMES H	
P.O. BOX 203518				
AUSTIN, TX 78720				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/01/2008 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/817,090

Applicant(s)

DUTTA, RABINDRANATH

Examiner

James H. Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an amendment filed 11/16/2006.

The application was abandoned 10/06/2005 due to applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office Action mailed 11/17/2004. A petition to revive the abandoned application was filed 11/16/2006 and was granted by the Office of Petitions 12/10/2007.

Claims 1-45 remain pending. Claims 1, 16, and 31 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-6, 14, 16-21, 29, 31-36 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Brown et al. (hereinafter Brown, "Using Netscape Communicator 4, Special Edition," copyright Jan 1997, QUE, pages 115-117).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Brown discloses:

- *A method of processing a structured document in an application, where the structured document comprises one or more elements comprising a set of elements* (Pgs. 115-117 → Brown describes a page setup dialog box invoked from within Netscape Navigator version 4 prior to printing a hardcopy of a web

page that allows the user to affect the subsequent processing of the web page prior to and while printing it), *the method comprising:*

- *configuring a print option, wherein the print option comprises one or more user-configurable print parameters that indicate a user preference with respect to reducing consumption of one or more physical resources during printing of the structured document by a browser* (Pgs. 115-117; Fig. 8.5 → Brown provides a page setup dialog box that allows the user to adjust page margins, as well as to allow the addition of page headers/footers to each subsequently printed page within Netscape Navigator 4.

Manipulation of these settings would act to reduce consumption of at least paper and toner/ink. For example, reducing the size of the margins would allow more content to fit on a given page as would eliminating the addition of page headers and/or footers to each page (i.e., by un-checking boxes). This would lead to a reduction in the number of pages needing to be printed and as a result use less toner/ink).

- *receiving a print request to print a hardcopy of the structured document being displayed within a browser window* (Pgs 115-117 → Brown describes that after altering page settings with the Page Setup dialog box (Fig. 8.5), a user can then either preview the settings changes (see Fig. 8.6) and then issue a print command, or can issue the print command directly);

- *in response to receiving the print request, detecting the print option* (Pgs. 116-117; Figs. 8.6, 8.7 → Brown describes a user selecting an option to print a web page, which then brings up Window's 95's print dialog box. Hence, selection of a print option is *indicated* at least visually by the appearance of the print dialog box);
- *in response to detecting the print option, generating a modified copy of the structured document in accordance with the user-configurable print parameters; and printing the hardcopy of the modified structured document* (Pgs. 116-117; Fig. 8.7 → Brown indicates that if the user foregoes previewing the web page(s) to be printed (e.g., ala Fig. 8.6) and instead invokes the print command from the menu bar (or Ctrl+P) directly and clicks the okay button, the web page(s) to be printed are modified per the page setup dialog selections and/or additional settings made from within the print dialog box (e.g., indicating which pages to print), and are printed by the printer).

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Brown discloses:

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to reduce consumption of color toner during printing of documents in response to the print request* (Pgs. 115-117; Fig. 8.5 → Brown provides a page setup dialog box that allows the user to adjust page margins, as well as to allow the addition of page headers/footers and to print text and lines in black only to each

subsequently printed page within Netscape Navigator 4. Manipulation of these settings would act to reduce consumption of toner/ink in two ways. First, reducing the size of the margins would allow more content to fit on a given page as would eliminating the addition of page headers and/or footers to each page (i.e., by unchecking boxes). This would lead to a reduction in the number of pages printed and as a result use less toner/ink). Second, by choosing to print text/lines in a single color (i.e. black) would reduce the use of color ink/toner at least where color text/lines occur in a page (e.g., hyperlinks typically indicated by colored underlines)).

In regard to dependent Claim 3, Brown discloses:

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to reduce consumption of color ink during printing of documents in response to the print request* (Pgs. 115-117; Fig. 8.5 → Brown provides a page setup dialog box that allows the user to adjust page margins, as well as to allow the addition of page headers/footers and to print text and lines in black only to each subsequently printed page within Netscape Navigator 4. Manipulation of these settings would act to reduce consumption of toner/ink in two ways. First, reducing the size of the margins would allow more content to fit on a given page as would eliminating the addition of page headers and/or footers to each page (i.e., by unchecking boxes). This would lead to a reduction in the number of pages printed and as a result use less toner/ink). Second, by choosing to print text/lines in a

single color (i.e. black) would reduce the use of color ink/toner at least where color text/lines occur in a page (e.g., hyperlinks typically indicated by colored underlines)).

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Brown discloses:

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to reduce consumption of paper during printing of documents in response to the print request* (Pgs. 115-117; Fig. 8.5 → Brown provides a page setup dialog box that allows the user to adjust page margins, as well as to allow the addition of page headers/footers to each subsequently printed page within Netscape Navigator 4. For example, reducing the size of the margins would allow more content to fit on a given page as would eliminating the addition of page headers and/or footers to each page (i.e., by un-checking boxes). This would lead to a reduction in the number of pages used to render the document).

In regard to dependent Claim 5, Brown discloses:

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference as to an amount of reduction of consumption of a physical resource during printing of documents in response to the print request* (Pgs. 115-117; Fig. 8.5 → Brown provides a page setup dialog box that allows the user to adjust page margins (in units of inches, i.e. *decrease left margin to 0.1 inch*), as well as to allow the addition of page headers/footers to each subsequently printed page within

Netscape Navigator 4. For example, reducing the size of the margins would allow more content to fit on a given page. This would lead to a reduction in the number of pages used to render the document).

In regard to dependent Claim 6, Brown discloses:

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to include, on the hardcopy of the modified copy of the structured document, a printed indication of a content modification to the structured document in response to the print request* (Pgs. 115-117; Fig. 8.5 → Brown provides a page setup dialog box that allows the user to adjust page margins (in units of inches, *i.e. decrease left margin to 0.1 inch*), as well as to allow the addition/omission of page headers/footers to each subsequently printed page within Netscape Navigator 4. For example, the act of reducing margin widths to fit more on a given printed page *would be indicated*, at least visibly, on the printed hardcopy by page content being printed closer to the edges of the page. Brown also allows the user to choose to have text and lines to be printed in black only. In the case where the output is being sent to a color printer, the occurrence of text/lines in black only would be indicative of those prior settings).

In regard to dependent Claim 14, Brown discloses:

- *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: transcoding an element to change a value associated with an*

attribute selected from the group consisting of: color, font size, or margin size
(Pg. 116, Fig. 8.5 → describes adjustment of margins that when applied would change the margins accordingly).

In regard to Claims 16-21, Claims 16-21 merely recite an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claims 1-6, respectively. Thus, Brown discloses every limitation of Claims 16-21, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1-6.

In regard to Claim 29, Claim 29 merely recites an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claim 14. Thus, Brown discloses every limitation of Claim 29, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 14.

In regard to Claims 31-36, Claims 31-36 merely recite a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claims 1-6, respectively. Thus, Brown discloses every limitation of Claims 31-36, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1-6.

In regard to Claim 44, Claim 44 merely recites a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claim 14. Thus, Brown discloses every limitation of Claim 44, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-8, 12, 15, 22-23, 27, 30, 37-38, 42 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Hoffman Jr. et al. (hereinafter Hoffman, U.S. Patent No. 6,122,657 filed 03/11/1997, issued 09/19/2000).

In regard to dependent Claim 7, Brown fails to disclose:

- *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises:*
 - *filtering the structured document to remove an element associated with a first Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) that is not located within a domain identified by a second URI by which the structured document was retrieved prior to being displayed within the browser window.*

However, Hoffman discloses *filtering the structured document to remove an element associated with a first Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) that is not located within a domain identified by a second URI by which the structured document was retrieved prior to being displayed within the browser window* (Col. 3, lines 25-38 → a dynamic web filter that modifies incoming structured (web) documents according to a user configuration. Hoffman also teaches that the filter

can disable tags such as tags that might link to images directed toward advertising (link contains for example a/ad/subdirectory) (see Col. 8, lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Brown and Hoffman as both inventions ultimately save resources. Hoffman adds filtering out components of web documents that are not desirable to the user. The benefit would have been to save resources by condensing what is viewed to the least number of pages possible, whether the output goes to a screen or to a printer.

In regard to dependent Claim 8, Brown fails to disclose:

- *determining that the first URI is within a configurable list of URIs prior to removing the element associated with the first URI.*

However, Hoffman discloses *determining that the first URI is within a configurable list of URIs prior to removing the element associated with the first URI* (Col. 30, lines 9-22 → describes that to kill or filter the image, the method allocates a memory buffer at line (458), for storing an image URL data structure. At line (475), the full tag is copied into the image URL structure. Then, at line (477), the method parses the image URL, and then parses the base URL at line (478). This setup allows the system to establish a network, connection with the site, if needed. At lines 483-484, the method creates a fully qualified image URL (structure), converting from relative addressing if needed. How the image is to be killed is determined at line (491), by referencing a per session cache storing results on how to process images.

If the image is on the user's personal kill list (configurable list) (tested at line 492), the method proceeds to kill the image. The specific call for killing the image occurs at line (501)). Hoffman's killing of an href tag containing an image would have effectively kept such content from being rendered either to a screen, a printer or other display or output device, providing the benefit of saving resources.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Brown and Hoffman as both inventions ultimately save resources. Hoffman adds filtering out components of web documents that are not desirable to the user. The benefit would have been to save resources by condensing what is viewed to the least number of pages possible, whether the output goes to a screen or to a printer.

In regard to dependent Claim 12, Brown fails to disclose:

- *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises:*
 - *deleting an element that is determined to be larger than a configurable maximum size.*

However, Hoffman describes a system to filter specified hypertext tags (i.e., *elements*) and any associated content from a web page in order to conserve resources (e.g., bandwidth). Specifically, Hoffman discloses *deleting an element that is determined to be larger than a configurable maximum size* (Col. 30, lines

23-28 → describes that the web Filter can be configured to kill ads or kill images larger than a pre-selected image size (tested at line 506).

Hoffman's invention is directed more towards conserving bandwidth by eliminating content from a display, causing it to download to a web browser faster. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would realize that this filtering would also conserve printer resources upon printing the web page since there would have been at least less content to print saving both paper and ink/toner.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown and Hoffman as both inventions address web page filtering to conserve resources. Adding the disclosure of Hoffman provides the benefit of eliminating content based on its size thereby providing a web page that occupies less space.

In regard to dependent Claim 15, Brown fails to disclose:

- *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises:*
 - *transcoding an element such that the element will not be rendered during a rendering process while printing the modified copy of the structured document.*

However, Hoffman discloses *transcoding an element such that the element will not be rendered during a rendering process while printing the*

modified copy of the structured document (Col. 8, lines 54-61 → that certain tag types require more complex processing. Consider, for instance, a href or "hyper reference" tag type, which is employed for establishing a hyperlink. An instruction to kill an href tag is, instead, an instruction to kill the image contained within the href tag. Accordingly, the corresponding handler must include logic not for killing the href tag but, instead, for setting a status flag indicating that the system should cycle through (in the dispatcher loop) the tag and kill the image tag contained within the href tag. This changes or *transcodes* the href tag by eliminating the image tag (attribute)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown and Hoffman as both references deal with modifying an original web document in order to save resources. The benefit of Hoffman's teaching is that it prevents an image from rendering without removing perhaps a hyperlink to the image.

In regard to Claims 22-23, 27, and 30, Claims 22-23, 27, and 30 merely recite an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claims 7-8, 12 and 15, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Hoffman discloses every limitation of Claims 22-23, 27, and 30 as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 7-8, 12 and 15.

In regard to Claims 37-38, 42, and 45, Claims 37-38, 42, and 45 merely recite a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claims 7-8, 12, and 15, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Hoffman discloses every limitation of Claims 37-38, 42, and 45, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 7-8, 12, and 15.

Claims 9-11, 24-26, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of FinePrint (documentation from old web site, 02/29/2000, downloaded from http://web.archive.org/web/20000301042424/www.singletrack.com/*>).

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Brown fails to disclose:

- *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: deleting an element.*

However, FinePrint describes a "non-printer" or "virtual" printer driver that captures printer output and provides additional formatting, control and data transfer options. It works with all printers and is treated by at least a Windows system as another printer driver selectable by a user desiring to print documents. As such, it is also available to all applications, including, for example, a web browser.

Specifically, one feature allows the user to skip (i.e. omit) bitmaps (see page 1 of 10, bullet entitled "save money!") contained in, for example, a web page. Such omission of bitmaps saves on expensive ink, paper, filing space, disposal costs, and printer wear and tear.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown and FinePrint as both provide a user with the means to alter web content to be printed such that printer resources are conserved. Adding the disclosure of FinePrint provides the benefit of omitting certain content elements that would be more expensive to render.

In regard to dependent Claim 10, Brown fails to disclose:

- *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: deleting all elements of a specified type.*

However, FinePrint describes a "non-printer" or "virtual" printer driver that captures printer output and provides additional formatting, control and data transfer options. It works with all printers and is treated by at least a Windows system as another printer driver selectable by a user desiring to print documents. As such, it is also available to all applications, including, for example, a web browser.

Specifically, one feature allows the user to skip (i.e. omit) bitmaps (a type of element) (see page 1 of 10, bullet entitled "save money!") contained in, for example, a web page. Such omission of bitmaps saves on expensive ink, paper, filing space, disposal costs, and printer wear and tear.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown and FinePrint as both provide a user with the means to alter web content to be printed such that printer resources are

conserved. Adding the disclosure of FinePrint provides the benefit of omitting certain content elements that would be more expensive to render.

In regard to dependent Claim 11, Brown fails to disclose:

- *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises: deleting an element associated with a graphical object.*

However, FinePrint describes a "non-printer" or "virtual" printer driver that captures printer output and provides additional formatting, control and data transfer options. It works with all printers and is treated by at least a Windows system as another printer driver selectable by a user desiring to print documents. As such, it is also available to all applications, including, for example, a web browser.

Specifically, one feature allows the user to skip (i.e. omit) bitmaps (typically a graphical object) (see page 1 of 10, bullet entitled "save money!") contained in, for example, a web page. Such omission of bitmaps saves on expensive ink, paper, filing space, disposal costs, and printer wear and tear.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown and FinePrint as both provide a user with the means to alter web content to be printed such that printer resources are conserved. Adding the disclosure of FinePrint provides the benefit of omitting certain content elements that would be more expensive to render.

In regard to Claims 24-26, Claims 24-26 merely recite an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claims 9-11, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of FinePrint discloses every limitation of Claims 24-26, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 9-11.

In regard to Claims 39-41, Claims 39-41 merely recite a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claims 9-11, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of FinePrint discloses every limitation of Claims 39-41, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 9-11.

Claims 13, 28, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Bickmore et al. (hereinafter Bickmore, "Digester: Device-independent Access to the World Wide Web," 03/24/2000, downloaded from <http://decweb.ethz.ch/WWW6/Technical/Paper177/Paper177.html>).

In regard to dependent Claim 13, Brown fails to disclose:

- *the step of generating a modified copy of the structured document further comprises:*
 - *deleting text within an element that is determined to be larger than a configurable maximum amount of text.*

However, Bickmore discloses *deleting text within an element that is determined to be larger than a configurable maximum amount of text* (Sec. 5, 3rd paragraph → describes techniques for reducing the amount of text displayed on

a pervasive (PDA, cell phone, pager) device from a web page originally intended for a normal browser. It has an automated scenario that provides the user with a forms-based control of the re-authoring process. Bickmore's invention also uses a technique referred to as FirstSentenceElision, which replaces each block of text with its first sentence (or phrase up to some natural break point), and also makes this sentence into a hypertext link to the original text block (see Sec. 4.1.2)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Brown and Bickmore because both inventions employ techniques to reduce the amount of resources needed to generate a web page. Bickmore adds a feature to reduce the amount of text displayed, and perhaps printed to enable one to conserve resources.

In regard to Claim 28, Claim 28 merely recites an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claim 13. Thus, Brown in view of Bickmore discloses every limitation of Claim 28, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 13.

In regard to Claim 43, Claim 43 merely recites a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claim 13. Thus, Brown in view of Bickmore discloses every limitation of Claim 43, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 13.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's however indicate in their response (see Sec. B, Page 11) that Claims 1, 16, and 43 require that printer settings be made *prior to* a print command being issued as indicated by the limitations of Claim 1 of:

"configuring a print option, wherein the print option comprises one or more user-configurable print parameters that indicate a user preference with respect to reducing consumption of one or more physical resources during printing of the structured document by a browser;"

and

"receiving a print request to print a hardcopy of the structured document being displayed within a browser window."

The Examiner notes that these two limitations do not explicitly recite any specific order in which they are carried out. Thus, the claims read on a print command that is issued prior to the configuration of printer settings, as disclosed in FinePrint.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is (571)272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James H. Blackwell
04/25/2008

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100